

## ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION


TO BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING STAFF			
FILE NUMBER		COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD #	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	DATE _____  BY _____
REZONING FILE NUMBER			

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE)
ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED <u>556 CAMBRIAN DR., CAMPBELL, CA 95008</u>
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S) <u>378-21-073-00</u>
REASON OF PROTEST <p>I protest the proposed rezoning because <u>See Attachment A I HAVE LIVED AT MY PRESENT ADDRESS FOR OVER FIFTY YEARS. I FEAR DETERIORATION OF FIRE, POLICE AND MEDICAL RESPONSE TIMES AND SERVICES BY ANNEXATION TO SAN JOSE.</u></p> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">Use separate sheet if necessary</p>
<p>The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filed, is situated at: <i>(describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number)</i></p> <p><u>556 CAMBRIAN DR., CAMPBELL, CA. 95008</u></p> <p><u>PARCEL NUMBER - 378-21-073-00</u></p>
<p>and is now zoned <u>R1-8</u> District. (in Santa Clara County)</p>
<p>The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Interest (ownership)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Leasehold interest which expires on _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other: <i>(explain)</i> _____</p>

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

**ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION****SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)**

This form must be signed by **ONE** or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRINT NAME <b>JOHN HOTTA</b>		DAYTIME TELEPHONE # <b>(408) 377-8831</b>	
ADDRESS <b>556 CAMBRIAN DR.</b>		CITY <b>CAMPBELL</b>	STATE <b>CA.</b>
SIGNATURE (Notarized) 		DATE <b>9/22/10</b>	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE #	
ADDRESS		CITY	STATE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE #	
ADDRESS		CITY	STATE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE #	
ADDRESS		CITY	STATE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE #	
ADDRESS		CITY	STATE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE #	
ADDRESS		CITY	STATE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	

Use separate sheet if necessary

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF

Santa Clara

)  
) ss.  
)

On Sept 22, 2010 before me, Diane M. James, Notary Public, personally appeared John Datta, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Diane M. James  
Notary Public

(Seal)



STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF \_\_\_\_\_

)  
) ss.  
)

On \_\_\_\_\_ before me, \_\_\_\_\_, Notary Public, personally appeared \_\_\_\_\_, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public

(Seal)

## ATTACHMENT A

### TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny -- the proposed Director Initiated Rezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Rezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

1. Rezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Rezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to -- the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
2. Rezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Rezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 -- an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning *de-annexation*), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
3. Rezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Rezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

service. As such, the City's intended annexation would not qualify for a streamlined urban island annexation pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3 because it does not meet the criteria set forth in Government Code § 56375.3(b)(6).

4. Staff Analysis of Rezoning is Insufficient. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Rezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Rezoning on my property.

5. Environmental Review of Rezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Rezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Rezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.

6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Rezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Rezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Rezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).

## ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

TO BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING STAFF			
FILE NUMBER		COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD #	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	DATE _____
REZONING FILE NUMBER			BY _____

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE)	
*	ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED <u>1420 LOIS WAY</u>
	ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S) <u>414-04-026-00</u>
	REASON OF PROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because <u>See Attachment A</u> <u>Campbell has been my home since 1958</u>
	Use separate sheet if necessary
*	The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filed, is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) <u>1420 LOIS WAY</u> <u>parcel # 414-04-026-00</u>
	and is now zoned <u>R1-8</u> District. (in Santa Clara County)
*	The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Interest (ownership) <input type="checkbox"/> Leasehold interest which expires on _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Other: (explain) _____

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

## ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)			
<p>This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.</p>			
* PRINT NAME 1420 Lois Way		DAYTIME TELEPHONE # 408-377 3191	
ADDRESS Campbell		CITY	STATE ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized) Lola J Kincannon		DATE 9-25-10	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE #	
ADDRESS		CITY	STATE ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE #	
ADDRESS		CITY	STATE ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE #	
ADDRESS		CITY	STATE ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE #	
ADDRESS		CITY	STATE ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE #	
ADDRESS		CITY	STATE ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
Use separate sheet if necessary			

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF

Santa Clara

SS.

On Sept 25, 2010 before me, Diane M. James, Notary Public, personally appeared Jane Jean Kim Cannon, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Diane M. James  
Notary Public

(Seal)



STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF \_\_\_\_\_

SS.

On \_\_\_\_\_ before me, \_\_\_\_\_, Notary Public, personally appeared \_\_\_\_\_, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public

(Seal)



ATTACHMENT A

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny -- the proposed Director Initiated Rezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Rezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

1. Rezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Rezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to -- the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
2. Rezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Rezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 -- an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning *de-annexation*), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
3. Rezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Rezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

service. As such, the City's intended annexation would not qualify for a streamlined urban island annexation pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3 because it does not meet the criteria set forth in Government Code § 56375.3(b)(6).

4. Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.

5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.

6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).

## ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

TO BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING STAFF			
FILE NUMBER	<u>ED C10-010</u>	COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD #	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	DATE _____
REZONING FILE NUMBER			BY _____

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE)	
ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED	<u>1339, 1351, 1361, 1373, 1524, 1510 Olympia Ave</u>
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S)	<u>414-04-019, 020, 021, 022, 003, 004</u> <u>Olympia Camden Camden</u>
REASON OF PROTEST	
<p>* I protest the proposed rezoning because <u>See Attachment A I HAVE LIVED IN EVERY HOUSE SINCE 1972 &amp; WORKED 1510-1524 CAMDEN SINCE 1960 I AM RETIRED &amp; DON'T NEED TO CHANGE INSURANCE LIC CAR'S ALL THE PAPER WORK</u> <small>Use separate sheet if necessary for all yrs I BEEN HERE</small></p> <p>The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filed, is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number)</p> <p>* <u>1339 OLYMPIA AVE Lot 15 (414-04-019)</u> <u>1373 414-04-022</u></p> <p><u>1351 OLYMPIA AVE Lot 14 (414-04-020)</u> <u>1524 414-04-003</u></p> <p><u>1361 OLYMPIA AVE Lot 13 (414-04-021)</u> <u>&amp; HOME 1510</u></p> <p>and is now zoned <u>R1-8</u> District, (in Santa Clara County) <u>414-04-004</u></p> <p>The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Interest (ownership)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Leasehold interest which expires on _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other: (explain) _____</p>	

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

## ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

## SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRINT NAME	BARRY L. BRACCO			DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	408-396-3581
ADDRESS	1339 OLYMPIA AVE	CITY	Campbell	STATE	Calif 95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	Barry L. Bracco			DATE	9-23-2010
PRINT NAME	BARRY L. BRACCO			DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	408-396-3581
ADDRESS	1351 OLYMPIA AVE	CITY	Campbell	STATE	Calif 95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	Barry L. Bracco			DATE	9-23-2010
PRINT NAME	BARRY L. BRACCO			DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	408-396-3581
ADDRESS	1361 OLYMPIA AVE	CITY	Campbell	STATE	Calif 95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	Barry L. Bracco			DATE	9-23-2010
PRINT NAME	BARRY L. BRACCO			DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	408-396-3581
ADDRESS	1373 OLYMPIA AVE	CITY	Campbell	STATE	Calif 95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	Barry L. Bracco			DATE	9-23-2010
PRINT NAME	BARRY L. BRACCO			DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	408-396-3581
ADDRESS	1510 Camden	CITY	Campbell	STATE	Calif 95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	Barry L. Bracco			DATE	9-23-2010
PRINT NAME	BARRY L. BRACCO			DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	408-396-3581
ADDRESS	1524 Camden	CITY	Campbell	STATE	Calif 95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	Barry L. Bracco			DATE	9-23-2010

Use separate sheet if necessary

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

SEE ATTACHED  
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT  
FROM NOTARY

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF Santa Clara

)  
) ss.  
)

On 9/23/2010 before me, Piyush Dave, Notary Public, personally appeared Barry Louis Bracco, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Piyush Dave  
Notary Public

(Seal)



STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF \_\_\_\_\_

)  
) ss.  
)

On \_\_\_\_\_ before me, \_\_\_\_\_, Notary Public, personally appeared \_\_\_\_\_, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public

(Seal)

**ATTACHMENT A**

**TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION**

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny -- the proposed Director Initiated Rezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Rezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:


1. Rezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Rezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to -- the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
2. Rezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Rezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 -- an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning *de-annexation*), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
3. Rezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Rezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

service. As such, the City's intended annexation would not qualify for a streamlined urban island annexation pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3 because it does not meet the criteria set forth in Government Code § 56375.3(b)(6).


4. Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.

5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.

6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).







# OLYMPIA AVENUE/LOIS WAY SEWER EXTENSION

## LEGEND:

Proposed Sewer Extension  
 Project Boundary  
 Assessor's Parcel Number

-----  
 -----  
 413-22-009-

## ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

TO BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING STAFF			
FILE NUMBER		COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD #	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	DATE _____
REZONING FILE NUMBER			BY _____

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE)	
ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED	401 DALLAS DRIVE
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S)	41239013
REASON OF PROTEST	
I protest the proposed rezoning because <u>See Attachment A</u>	
Use separate sheet if necessary	
The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filed, is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number)	
401 Dallas Drive	
412-39013	
and is now zoned <u>R1-8</u> District. (in Santa Clara County)	
The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Interest (ownership)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Leasehold interest which expires on _____	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other: (explain) _____	

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

## ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

## SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRINT NAME KENNETH SCHOCK		DAYTIME TELEPHONE # 408-623-2185	
ADDRESS 401 DALLAS DR	CITY Campbell	STATE CA	ZIP CODE 95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized) [Signature]		DATE 9/22/10	
PRINT NAME ANITA SCHOCK		DAYTIME TELEPHONE # 408-593-5176	
ADDRESS 401 Dallas Dr	CITY Campbell	STATE CA	ZIP CODE 95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized) [Signature]		DATE 9/22/10	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE #	
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE #	
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE #	
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE #	
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	

Use separate sheet if necessary

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF

Santa Clara

ss.

On Sept 22, 2010 before me, Diane M. James Notary Public, personally appeared Herminia Robert Schoeb who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Diane M. James  
Notary Public

(Seal)



STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF

Santa Clara

ss.


On Sept 22, 2010 before me, Diane M. James Notary Public, personally appeared Vanita Luz Schoeb who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Diane M. James  
Notary Public

(Seal)



**ATTACHMENT A**

**TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION**

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny -- the proposed Director Initiated Rezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Rezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

1. Rezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Rezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to -- the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
2. Rezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Rezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 -- an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning *de-annexation*), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
3. Rezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Rezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

service. As such, the City's intended annexation would not qualify for a streamlined urban island annexation pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3 because it does not meet the criteria set forth in Government Code § 56375.3(b)(6).

4. Staff Analysis of Rezoning is Insufficient. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Rezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Rezoning on my property.

5. Environmental Review of Rezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Rezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Rezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.

6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Rezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Rezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Rezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).

**CITY OF SAN JOSE**

Planning, Building and Code Enforcement  
200 East Santa Clara Street  
San José, CA 95113-1905  
tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055  
Website: [www.sanjoseca.gov/planning](http://www.sanjoseca.gov/planning)

**ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION**

TO BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING STAFF			
FILE NUMBER		COUNCIL DISTRICT	DATE _____ BY _____
QUAD #	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	
REZONING FILE NUMBER			

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE)	
ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED <u>364 Curtner Ave. Campbell, Ca. 95008</u>	
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S) <u>414-02-001-00</u>	
REASON OF PROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because <u>See Attachment A</u> _____ _____ Use separate sheet if necessary	
The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filed, is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) <u>364 Curtner Ave. Campbell, Ca. 95008</u> <u>414-02-001-00</u> _____	
and is now zoned <u>R1-8</u> District. (in Santa Clara County)	
The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Interest (ownership) <input type="checkbox"/> Leasehold Interest which expires on _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Other: (explain) _____ _____ _____	

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

Zoning Protest pr 65/ Application Rev. 8/2/2006

**ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION**

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)			
<p>This form must be signed by <b>ONE</b> or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.</p>			
PRINT NAME <i>Antonius C. Len</i>	DAYTIME TELEPHONE # <i>409 396-5177</i>		
ADDRESS <i>364 Curtner Ave</i>	CITY <i>Campbell</i>	STATE <i>Ca</i>	ZIP CODE <i>95208</i>
SIGNATURE (Notarized) <i>[Signature]</i>			DATE <i>9-22-10</i>
PRINT NAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE #		
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE
PRINT NAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE #		
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE
PRINT NAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE #		
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE
PRINT NAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE #		
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE
PRINT NAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE #		
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE

Use separate sheet if necessary

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

Zoning Protest.ppt/BS/2/2008 Rev. 6/22/2008



STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF

Santa Clara

)  
) ss.  
)

On Sept 22, 2010 before me, Diane M. James Notary Public, personally appeared Antonio A. E. Jim, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Diane M. James  
Notary Public



STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF \_\_\_\_\_

)  
) ss.  
)

On \_\_\_\_\_ before me, \_\_\_\_\_, Notary Public, personally appeared \_\_\_\_\_, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public

(Seal)

ATTACHMENT A

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny -- the proposed Director Initiated Rezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Rezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

1. Rezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Rezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to -- the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
2. Rezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Rezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 -- an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning *de-annexation*), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
3. Rezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Rezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

service. As such, the City's intended annexation would not qualify for a streamlined urban island annexation pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3 because it does not meet the criteria set forth in Government Code § 56375.3(b)(6).

4. Staff Analysis of Rezoning is Insufficient. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Rezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Rezoning on my property.

5. Environmental Review of Rezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Rezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Rezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.

6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Rezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Rezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Rezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).

## ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

TO BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING STAFF			
FILE NUMBER		COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD #	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	DATE _____  BY _____
REZONING FILE NUMBER			

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE)	
ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED	375 Curtner Ave
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S)	412 - 39 - 048
REASON OF PROTEST	
I protest the proposed rezoning because <u>See Attachment A</u>	
Use separate sheet if necessary	
The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filed, is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number)	
375 CURTNER AVE. CO	
412 - 39 - 048	
and is now zoned <u>R1-8</u> District. (in Santa Clara County)	
The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Interest (ownership)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Leasehold Interest which expires on _____	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other: (explain) _____	

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

## ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

## SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRINT NAME	Thomas L. Davis			DAYTIME TELEPHONE #	559-1604
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE		
	375	Curtner Ave.	Campbell Ca	95008	
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	Thomas L. Davis			DATE	9-23-10
PRINT NAME				DAYTIME TELEPHONE #	
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE		
SIGNATURE (Notarized)				DATE	
PRINT NAME				DAYTIME TELEPHONE #	
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE		
SIGNATURE (Notarized)				DATE	
PRINT NAME				DAYTIME TELEPHONE #	
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE		
SIGNATURE (Notarized)				DATE	
PRINT NAME				DAYTIME TELEPHONE #	
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE		
SIGNATURE (Notarized)				DATE	
PRINT NAME				DAYTIME TELEPHONE #	
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE		
SIGNATURE (Notarized)				DATE	
Use separate sheet if necessary					

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF Santa Clara

)  
) ss.  
)

On 9-23-10 before me, James V. DeLong, Notary Public, personally appeared Thomas L. Davis, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.


I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

James V. DeLong  
Notary Public



(Seal)



STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF \_\_\_\_\_

)  
) ss.  
)

On \_\_\_\_\_ before me, \_\_\_\_\_, Notary Public, personally appeared \_\_\_\_\_, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public

(Seal)

ATTACHMENT A

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny -- the proposed Director Initiated Rezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Rezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

1. Rezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Rezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to -- the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
2. Rezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Rezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 -- an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning *de-annexation*), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
3. Rezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Rezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

service. As such, the City's intended annexation would not qualify for a streamlined urban island annexation pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3 because it does not meet the criteria set forth in Government Code § 56375.3(b)(6).

4. Staff Analysis of Rezoning is Insufficient. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Rezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Rezoning on my property.

5. Environmental Review of Rezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Rezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 – more than 16 years ago – and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Rezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.

6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Rezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Rezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Rezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



**CITY OF SAN JOSE**

Planning, Building and Code Enforcement  
200 East Santa Clara Street  
San Jose, CA 95113-1905  
tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055  
Website: [www.sanjoseca.gov/planning](http://www.sanjoseca.gov/planning)

**ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION**

TO BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING STAFF			
FILE NUMBER		COUNCIL DISTRICT	DATE _____ BY _____
QUAD #	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	
REZONING FILE NUMBER			

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE)	
ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED	378 Curtner Ave. Campbell, CA 95008
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S)	414-02-002-00
REASON OF PROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because <u>See Attachment A</u>   Use separate sheet if necessary	
The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filed, is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) <u>378 Curtner Ave. Campbell, CA 95008</u> <u>414-02-002-00</u>	
and is now zoned <u>R1-8</u> District. (in Santa Clara County)	
The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Interest (ownership) <input type="checkbox"/> Leasehold interest which expires on _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Other: (explain) _____   	

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

## ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

## SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRINT NAME <b>Janice K. Schilling</b>		DAYTIME TELEPHONE# <b>(408) 772-1994</b>	
ADDRESS <b>378 Curtner Ave.</b>	CITY <b>Campbell</b>	STATE <b>CA</b>	ZIP CODE <b>95008</b>
SIGNATURE (Notarized) <i>Janice K. Schilling</i>		DATE <b>9/27/10</b>	
PRINT NAME <b>Keith C. Schilling</b>		DAYTIME TELEPHONE# <b>(408) 772-1995</b>	
ADDRESS <b>378 Curtner Ave.</b>	CITY <b>Campbell</b>	STATE <b>CA</b>	ZIP CODE <b>95008</b>
SIGNATURE (Notarized) <i>Keith C. Schilling</i>		DATE <b>9/27/10</b>	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	

Use separate sheet if necessary

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.


STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF Santa Clara

)  
) ss.  
)

On 9/27/2010 before me, Maria Pepper, Notary Public, personally appeared Tania Kathleen & Keith Charles Schilling, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.  
  
Notary Public



(Seal)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF \_\_\_\_\_

)  
) ss.  
)

On \_\_\_\_\_ before me, \_\_\_\_\_, Notary Public, personally appeared \_\_\_\_\_, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public

(Seal)

ATTACHMENT A

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny -- the proposed Director Initiated Rezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Rezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

1. Rezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Rezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to -- the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
2. Rezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Rezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 -- an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning *de-annexation*), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
3. Rezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Rezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

service. As such, the City's intended annexation would not qualify for a streamlined urban island annexation pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3 because it does not meet the criteria set forth in Government Code § 56375.3(b)(6).

4. Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.

5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.

6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).

## ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

TO BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING STAFF			
FILE NUMBER		COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD #	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	
REZONING FILE NUMBER		DATE _____ BY _____	

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE)	
ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED <u>391 CORTNER AV</u>	
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S) <u>412-39-047</u>	
REASON OF PROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because <u>See Attachment A</u> _____ _____ _____ Use separate sheet if necessary	
The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filed, is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) <u>391 CORTNER AV.</u> <u>Assessor number 412-39-047</u> _____	
and is now zoned <u>R1-8</u> District. (in Santa Clara County)	
The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Interest (ownership) <input type="checkbox"/> Leasehold interest which expires on _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Other: (explain) _____ _____ _____	

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

## ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

## SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRINT NAME <b>PAUL C SANTINA</b>		DAYTIME TELEPHONE# <b>408 377-6878</b>	
ADDRESS <b>391 CORTNER AV</b>		CITY <b>CAMPBELL</b>	STATE ZIP CODE <b>CA 95008</b>
SIGNATURE (Notarized) <i>Paul C. Santina</i>		DATE <b>9/22/10</b>	
PRINT NAME <b>MARY E SANTINA</b>		DAYTIME TELEPHONE# <b>408 377-6870</b>	
ADDRESS <b>391 CORTNER AV</b>		CITY <b>CAMPBELL</b>	STATE ZIP CODE <b>CA 95008</b>
SIGNATURE (Notarized) <i>Mary E. Santina</i>		DATE <b>9/22/10</b>	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS		CITY	STATE ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS		CITY	STATE ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS		CITY	STATE ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS		CITY	STATE ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	

Use separate sheet if necessary

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF

Santa Clara

)  
) ss.  
)


On Sept 22, 2010 before me, Diane M. James Notary Public, personally appeared Paul Carol Santana, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Diane M. James  
Notary Public

(Seal)



STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF

Santa Clara

)  
) ss.  
)

On Sept 22, 2010 before me, Diane M. James Notary Public, personally appeared Mary Ellen Santana, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Diane M. James  
Notary Public

(Seal)





ATTACHMENT A

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny -- the proposed Director Initiated Rezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Rezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

1. Rezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Rezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to -- the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
2. Rezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Rezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 -- an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning *de-annexation*), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
3. Rezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Rezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

service. As such, the City's intended annexation would not qualify for a streamlined urban island annexation pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3 because it does not meet the criteria set forth in Government Code § 56375.3(b)(6).

4. Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.

5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San José's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.

6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).

## ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

TO BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING STAFF			
FILE NUMBER	<b>11-010-010</b>	COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD #	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	DATE _____
REZONING FILE NUMBER			BY _____

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE)	
ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED	<u>271 Dallas Dr Campbell 95008</u>
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S)	<u>412-39-024</u>
REASON OF PROTEST	
I protest the proposed rezoning because <u>See Attachment A</u>	
_____	
_____	
Use separate sheet if necessary	
<p>The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filed, is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number)</p> <p><u>271 DALLAS DR CAMPBELL 95008</u></p> <p><u>412-39-024</u></p>	
and is now zoned <u>R1-8</u> District. (in Santa Clara County)	
<p>The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Interest (ownership)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Leasehold interest which expires on _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other: (explain) _____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

## ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

## SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by **ONE** or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRINT NAME	JACK SPINLER			DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	559-1889
ADDRESS	271 DALLAS DR	CITY	CAMPBELL	STATE	GA 95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	Jack Spinler			DATE	9-22-10
PRINT NAME	THERESA SPINLER			DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	559-1889
ADDRESS	271 DALLAS DR	CITY	CAMPBELL	STATE	GA 95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	Theresa Spinler			DATE	9-22-10
PRINT NAME				DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS		CITY		STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)				DATE	
PRINT NAME				DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS		CITY		STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)				DATE	
PRINT NAME				DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS		CITY		STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)				DATE	
PRINT NAME				DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS		CITY		STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)				DATE	

Use separate sheet if necessary

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF

Santa Clara

SS.

On Sept 22, 2010 before me, Diane M. James Notary Public, personally appeared Jack Spindler who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Diane M. James  
Notary Public

(Seal)



STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF

Santa Clara

SS.

On Sept 22, 2010 before me, Diane M. James Notary Public, personally appeared Theresa Spindler who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Diane M. James  
Notary Public

(Seal)



ATTACHMENT A

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny -- the proposed Director Initiated Rezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Rezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

1. Rezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Rezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to -- the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
2. Rezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Rezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 -- an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning *de-annexation*), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
3. Rezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Rezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

service. As such, the City's intended annexation would not qualify for a streamlined urban island annexation pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3 because it does not meet the criteria set forth in Government Code § 56375.3(b)(6).

4. Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



CITY OF SAN JOSE  
Planning, Building and Code Enforcement  
200 East Santa Clara Street  
San Jose, CA 95113-1905  
tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055  
Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

## ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

TO BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING STAFF			
FILE NUMBER	C10-010	COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD #	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	DATE
REZONING FILE NUMBER			BY

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE)	
ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED 281 DALLAS DR., Campbell 95008	
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S) 412-39-023	
REASON OF PROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because <u>See Attachment A</u>	
Use separate sheet if necessary	
The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filed, is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) 281 Dallas Dr., Campbell Ca 95008 412-39-023	
and is now zoned <u>R1-8</u> District, (in Santa Clara County)	
The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Interest (ownership) <input type="checkbox"/> Leasehold interest which expires on _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Other: (explain) _____	

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

Zoning Protest Form 65 (Application Rev. 6/2/2009)



## ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

## SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRINT NAME	Carol Swanson			DAYTIME TELEPHONE #	
ADDRESS	281 Driggs Dr.	CITY	Campbell	STATE	CA 95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	[Signature]			DATE	9/27/10
PRINT NAME	Kari Swanson			DAYTIME TELEPHONE #	
ADDRESS	281 Driggs Dr.	CITY	Campbell	STATE	CA 95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	[Signature]			DATE	9/27/10
PRINT NAME				DAYTIME TELEPHONE #	
ADDRESS		CITY		STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)				DATE	
PRINT NAME				DAYTIME TELEPHONE #	
ADDRESS		CITY		STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)				DATE	
PRINT NAME				DAYTIME TELEPHONE #	
ADDRESS		CITY		STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)				DATE	
PRINT NAME				DAYTIME TELEPHONE #	
ADDRESS		CITY		STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)				DATE	

Use separate sheet if necessary

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF Santa Clara

)  
) ss.  
)

On Sept 22, 2010 before me, Diane M. James Notary Public, personally appeared Carl Wilbur Swanson who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Diane M. James  
Notary Public



(Seal)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA


)  
) ss.  
)

On 9/21/2010 before me, M. S. Lucio Notary Public, personally appeared Karl Rachelle Swanson who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

M. S. Lucio  
Notary Public



(Seal)

service. As such, the City's intended annexation would not qualify for a streamlined urban island annexation pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3 because it does not meet the criteria set forth in Government Code § 56375.3(b)(6).

4. Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.

5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.

6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).